

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	ATTY'S DKT: SUZUKI28
)	
SUZUKI et al.)	
)	
Appln. No.: 10/076,070)	
Patent No. 6,814,239)	
)	Washington, D.C.
Filed: February 15, 2002)	
Granted: November 9, 2004)	
)	January 9, 2008
)	
For: HIGH-PURITY STANDARD...)	
)	Conf. No. 8511

PETITION FOR DUPLICATE LETTERS PATENT

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building, Mail Stop
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Sir:

Applicant respectfully petitions for the issuance of duplicate Letters Patent for the above-identified matter.

A declaration is attached, which indicates the course of events that led to the request. This declaration establishes that a diligent effort was made to recover the original document.

The petition fee under 37 CFR 1.182 and 37 CFR 1.17(f), of \$400.00, is being paid by credit card.

Respectfully submitted,
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /rlb/
Roger L. Browdy
Registration No. 25,618

RLB:edg

G:\BN\K\Kanf\Suzuki28\PTO\2007-12-24petitionduplletterspatent.doc

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	ATTY'S DKT: SUZUKI28
)	
SUZUKI et al.)	
)	
Appln. No.: 10/076,070)	
Patent No. 6,814,239)	
)	Washington, D.C.
Filed: February 15, 2002)	
Granted: November 9, 2004)	
)	
)	
For: HIGH-PURITY STANDARD...)	
)	Conf. No. 8511

DECLARATION OF ERIN DILLON GERAGHTY

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building, Mail Stop
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

I, Erin Dillon Geraghty, hereby declare and state as follows:

I have been employed by Browdy and Neimark since August 1992. I have been the Office Manager since February 2005, prior to which time I was the head of the paralegals/docketing department.

Prior to my heading the paralegal and docketing departments, I was a secretary/paralegal for the firm.

It is standard operating procedure in the office of Browdy and Neimark that when an original Letters Patent is received, it is immediately matched up with the correct file

In re of Patent No. 6,814,239

and then brought to the docketing department. Once the file is given to the docketing department, a clerk compares the document with the docketing system and indicates on a Post-It note the expiration date and all maintenance fee dates.

After the above steps are completed, the file is given to one of two receptionists to prepare a letter, for signature by the Office Manager, reporting receipt of and forwarding the Letters Patent. This letter includes all pertinent information regarding expiration and maintenance fees.

Before signing the letter, it is the duty of the Office Manager to verify that it is correctly addressed. A copy of the letter is then placed in the file for record keeping purposes. After the document has been signed, the envelope with the letter and attached Letters Patent is given to the mailroom for mailing.

The facts as I have put them together regarding the above-identified matter, after a thorough review of the relevant files and associated documents and correspondence, are as follows.

The original Letters Patent was received in November 2004. At that time, the document was placed with the proper file and given to the docketing department. The docketing department, on a Post-It note (a copy of which is submitted herewith as Exhibit A), noted the expiration and maintenance fee dates and the file was then given to Ms. Nichole Wooten, a receptionist at that time.

In re of Patent No. 6,814,239

Ms. Wooten prepared the letter as directed, and then sent it to Ms. Patricia McInnis, the Office Manager at that time, who reviewed then signed the letter (a copy of which is submitted herewith as Exhibit B). After signing the letter, Ms. McInnis presumably gave the letter to the mailroom for mailing to the client. The letter referenced the correct patent and was addressed properly to the correct client.

It was believed by the office of the undersigned that the Letters Patent had been safely received in the office of our client, Kanesaka & Sakai. It was not until receipt of a letter from the office of Kanesaka & Sakai on November 16, 2007, that the office of the undersigned learned that the Letters Patent had not been safely received. Upon receipt of this letter, an email was sent indicating where and when the Letters Patent was mailed to the office of Kanesaka & Sakai, and requesting that they conduct a thorough search of their office for the missing document. The office of Kanesaka & Sakai have now thoroughly searched their records and have found no indication that the document was received (a copy of the letter to this effect received from Kanesaka & Sakai is submitted herewith as Exhibit C).

Thus, it is now necessary to request a duplicate Letters Patent.

I declare further, that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that

In re of Patent No. 6,814,239

willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

February 1, 2008

Date

/Erin Dillon Geraghty/

Erin Dillon Geraghty